

MULTI-WORD LEXICAL ENTRIES IN LSP DICTIONARIES: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Elzara Vasilovna Gafiyatova, Marina Ivanovna Solnishkina

Department of Contrastive Linguistics and Linguodidactics,
Kazan Federal University, Kazan (RUSSIA)

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/13

Received: 06 Jan, 2015

Accepted: 01 Mar, 2015

ABSTRACT

The article presents some selected aspects of the work in connection with English Forestry Dictionary covering the field of forestry. The emphasis is on the microstructure of the dictionary. In contrast to existing dictionaries in the field, this is a bilingual print dictionary of non-formal register designed to help the user see English foresters' "world picture", the way the English Forestry sublanguage mirrors the world. The dictionary provides the user with an in-depth treatment of the language used within the selected subject-field. The main principles of compiling the Dictionary are: etimological, thematic, functional. The dictionary entry contains orthoepic information, grammatical information, bibliographic information, definition, phrases, cross-references, illustrative examples, collocations.

Key words: LSP dictionaries, professional traditions, corpus analysis, low register, professional discourse

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, research in such areas as sociolinguistics and lexicography including studies of professional terminology have expanded rapidly. Professional jargons and social groups argot on the other hand are still in the outskirts of the mainstream research. The papers on the topic issued in the last decade are still few [1-6] and the dictionaries are predominantly monolingual [7-13]. The reasons for this – the task being time-consuming and expensive – do not stop those who are ready to spend hours to register, transcribe, define, and present to the reader unique language of the low register professional discourse deprived of censorship.

Oral professional communication is regulated by the type of the language, communication stereotypes and the existing paradigm of corporate culture. It is the area where the language development trends and cultural traditions are very well observed, though not regulated by formal guidelines.

Professional traditions and stereotypes have been dealt with both in foreign and Russian linguistics [14-16]. Modern sociolinguistics has developed a strong trend aimed at reflecting professional cultures and languages [1,8,11,9], but the research on the ways of representing norms and stereotypes of different professional cultures in the professional sublanguage is far from being completed.

"Language is undoubtedly the area of social life where norms matter most" [3]. The *norm* is regarded by the author as an "authorized setting, regular, generally accepted, obligatory procedure, sample, rule" [17]. It defines the range of "good" and "bad", sets the boundaries of the approved and disapproved by the society range of referents: activities, objects, their parameters.

Within a professional language, the norm as an invariant category is realized in the norm of the 1st level (standard, literary norm, code, high register) and in the norm of the 2nd level (substandard, sub-code, low register) [4]. The subprofessional standard norm registered in a number of folklore genres defines the behaviour of a professional personality (both communicative and non-communicative) in different situations of high register communication, e.g. "I chop down trees, I wear high heels, /Suspenders and a bra. /I wish I'd been a girlie/Just like my dear papa [18]. As there are minimum limitations and taboos in substandard communication, it is logical to assume that it is the substandard that does reflect real pragmatic and linguistic norms and stereotypes of a professional community. A professional standard as an ideology-driven phenomenon reflects values and norms of the society, not the professional community.

The *language norm* as a set of the most stable, traditional language means and usage adopted in a certain society in a certain period of time [19] and a dynamic category changes with the language. Changes and deviations are inevitable consequences of the social life in communities. The development and progress in the social, political and technological system are manifested in the vocabulary of a language. New words are introduced and old ones die out. Unlike the standard norm, the norm of a professional substandard is inconsistent, dynamic and semantically blurry.

Norm intension of a professional substandard is a set of adopted rules in a certain professional society stereotypes, parameters of referents [6]. For example, *The lumberman's life is a wearisome one, But some say 't is free from all care; With the ringing of an ax From daylight until dark In the middle of some forest you'll hear'* [20].

"There were four classes of tree, roughly mirroring classes in early Irish society. These were the airig fedo ('nobles of the wood'), the aithig fedo ('commoners of the wood'), the fodla fedo ('lower divisions of the wood') and the losa fedo ('bushes of the wood'). Which group a tree belonged to depended on its economic importance, usually related to its fruit, timber or size when fully grown'" [21].

English Forestry Dictionary is a new type of dictionary comprising the vocabulary used by professional foresters in low register. It contains over 2,000 entries and about 1,500 phrases presented in rich text format articles. The Dictionary includes variety of words, phrases, collocations, and common idioms. In general terms the dictionary is a descriptive one, presenting the vocabulary of the professional language, Language for Specific Purposes, as a system at a particular point of time (XXth – XXIth centuries).

The Dictionary *macrostructure* as the overall structural organization of the volume contains introduction and user guidelines (User's Guide; List of Symbols; List of Abbreviations); body (entries and definitions) organized alphabetically;

appendices and additional information (Sayings; Jokes. Sources of lemmata (Lemmata Corpus); Sources of illustrative examples (Illustrative Corpus)).

The Dictionary *microstructure* as the internal structure of dictionary entry blocks consists of: 1. Headword (lemma, form to be looked up); 2. Orphoeic characteristics (pronunciation); 3. Grammatical information (part of speech category or word class); 4. Lemmata (Corpus references); 5. Functional and stylistic information; 6. Definition (semantic specification – senses and reference); 7. Illustrations (usage with examples); 8. Lemma comprising phaseological units and idioms (collocations, co-occurrence strings); 9. Phaseological units and idioms illustrations; 10. Cross-references to related items, related by sense; 11. Commentaries on etymology (etymological or historical notes). For example,

Choker, a length of wire rope with attachments for encircling the end of a log to be yarded, *n*.

♦ **Choker setter**, a person in a logging operation who places the choker around the log to be hauled to the landing; one who attaches chokers to logs in the woods for the skidding unit; beginning job for novice loggers.

The Dictionary exercises functionality to the lookup routine to handle multi-word lexical items, such as compounds or idioms. When verbal phrasemes containing a fixed noun are ordered alphabetically by the noun, the dictionary is still consistent in presenting different forms (i.e., the same category first) in order to facilitate the search in case there are numerous verbal idioms with the same head noun.

cut, *v*.

♦ **backcut (felling cut)**, the last of the three cuts required to fall a tree. Located on the opposite side of the tree from the face and minimally 1" above the horizontal cut of the face. The 1" is referred to as stump shot and prevents the tree from kicking back over the stump toward the faller. The backcut must never be continued to a point at which no holding wood remains. Variations of backcutting are discussed in: face-boring backcut, side-boring backcut, and side-notching backcut. The term 'LSP dictionary' is applied to two different types of dictionaries: dictionary of codified terminology used in formal register of professional communication; dictionary of non-codified vocabulary practiced in informal register of professional communication. Dictionaries of non-codified vocabulary differ from all other LSP dictionaries in the lexical stock of the sublanguage they register, i.e. lexical units of the primarily oral or electronic professional discourse not those of the written ones.

♦ **clear-cut**, an area in which all of the trees have been or will be felled, bucked and skidded in one operation. When all trees in a given area are felled.

♦ **cut-up**, tree or log left standing or suspended with the falling or bucking cuts almost completed.

♦ **cutter**, one whose primary job is to fall, buck or limb trees before they are moved to the landing area

2. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

To reveal the ways pragmatic and linguistic norms are verbalized in multi-word entries of an LSP dictionary: 1) The LSP dictionaries analysis of the norm was performed to bring out the *definitions by enumeration of senses and definitions of extension*. The contextualization of the norm is expected to reveal new connotations in its meaning. 2) Corpus analysis involves the analysis of the occurrences of the *direct definition*, and *definitions of the domains of "the possible"* in the Corpus of professional discourse. The aim of the corpus analysis is to collect the definitions and establish the frequency of direct definitions. "Corpus-based technologies provide an opportunity to study real language use in ... texts of different types" [22]. This part of the study also reveals the context of direct definitions and the definitions of the domains of "the possible". Besides, the determination of the frequency of their use and context they are used with is to reveal the changes in norm.

The *objects* of the study are the ways in which the pragmatic and linguistic norms of a professional community are verbalized in multi-word entries of an LSP dictionary. The data are presented by over 2.000 set phrases, collocations, idioms, sayings registered in Russian and English printed and electronic LSP dictionaries [23-28] as well as texts, the collective authors of which are professional personalities (tales, jokes, toasts, songs, myths, legends etc.) or individuals professionally engaged in some area (informal letters, cards, journals, blogs, chats etc.). The authors' specialized corpus contains over 3.000 illustrations of the above enumerated units functioning in low register professional discourse - texts of various genres of forestry.

Professional substandard language demonstrates a wide spectrum of the ways the norm is verbalized: *direct definitions*, *definitions by enumeration of senses*, *definitions of the domain of "the possible"* and *definitions of extension*.

I. *Direct definitions* of the norm imply definition by demonstrating the referent, defining it either by description, narration or exhibiting. **Timing**, commences when the axe hits the wood (or when the guns sounds or when the emcee says "GO" - this is dependent on the individual show), and ends when the block is completely severed [29].

The texts of this type of definition depending on the parameters of the object defined may contain elements of description or narration. For example, Oh, tonight the boat is rocky./And I ain't got a bunk./Not a rare of cheering liquor./Just a turkey full of junk./All I call my life's possessions,/Is just what I carry 'round./For I've blown the rest on skid-roads./Of a hundred gyppo towns [25].

Rules from experienced forests say **bar or blade**, that part of the chain saw upon which the cutting chain travels. Long, thin projection of the chain saw upon which the saw chain travels. Improper use of the bar results in kickbacks and saw cuts. It is the extreme top and bottom of the bar's nose that is sensitive [30].

II. *Definitions by enumeration of senses of the norm* are non-systematized enumerations of all senses of a sign in one particular area. E.g. The intension of the term **corners** is defined by three senses: 1. The extreme outside position of the holding wood on either side of the tree. 2. Left and right side of the holding wood. 3. Corner of the falling "face". The substandard adds to the two above a number of senses realized in multi-word entries **corner-nipping special technique of partially cutting the extreme outside holding wood corners to prevent root pull, slabbing and alteration of the desired falling direction** and **corner block**, the first block the haulback passes through on its way to the tail block.

The definitions of this kind are typical for professional sublanguage and rank the professional vocabulary by the density of its nominations in the sublanguage and their frequency in the discourse. They serve as emotive rate indexes of a referent: the higher the rank the more significant the referent for the language users. E.g. in foresters substandard: **exotic forest**, a thinned and pruned radiata stand is more aesthetically pleasing than an untended radiata stand [31].

Substandard nominations unlike those of standard are typically secondary nominations of a person, his actions and characteristics, not of an artifact or of a process of production: **Timber Beast**, forest service personnel (or any establishment types) who invariably side with timber industry. Someone obsessed with denuding woodland of all marketable timber. **a logger**, a lumberjack.

The nominations reflect professionals' worldview on a particular referent: **Barber chair**, *a tree that, while in the process of receiving the back cut, splits lengthwise and leaves a vertical piece of wood on top of the stump. The remaining piece sticking up in the air is reminiscent of a chair.*

III. Defining the domain of "the possible" implies defining the existing links and connections, limiting "the permissible" and "the compulsory", and "integrating the norm into the common system of order of community activities" [32].

Unfortunately the professional society is not complete without underpayment, hardships and improper attitude: **The Timber Beast's Lament**

*I'm on the boat for the camp
With a sick and aching head;
I've blown another winter's stake,
And got the jims instead.
It seems I'll never learn the truth
That's written plain as day,
It's the only time they welcome you
Is when you make it pay [25].*

The research shows that "the so called 'disorderliness' has not only its logics and rules but also analogies in history of traditional cultures dating back to antiquity" [33].

At the same time, even in low register communication, direct nominations of errors, death, deceases, traumas, poverty, wars, people or artifacts not meeting the requirements of the community are substituted by euphemisms, for example, **beaver-tailing**, *burying the whole bar of the saw while cutting.*

This euphemisation mechanism becomes transparent when the semantic structures of a substitute and its correlate – antecedent – are compared. In many cases, it is founded on semantic reduction, or extension, when one or a number of semes are removed from the structure of the denotative component of the meaning of antecedent, sometimes a seme becomes potential. Examples include: **to cross the lead**, *intentional or unintentional falling of a tree across the established lead of falling direction. Although crossing the lead may be caused by wind, it generally is a result of improper falling technique.*

The range of euphemisation instruments of professional substandard includes both syntactic (abbreviation, ellipses) and lexical (metaphor, metonymy, antonymy, synonymy, hyperonymy, pronominalization, etc.) ways: **snag**, 1. *Any standing dead tree or portion thereof; 2. A dead or dying tree that is still standing. Snags must be felled prior to beginning.* **spike top**, *a live tree that has a dead barkless top.*

In many cases professional substandard euphemisation adds not only neutral but positive or ameliorative connotation to the nomination (see the examples above).

Disphemisation as the substitution of a more offensive or disparaging word or phrase for one considered less offensive either about the referent or to the audience. The peculiarity of disphemisation in low-register professional communication is that it does not always offend the communication partner due to lower standards of ethics in professional substandard and high frequency of dysphemisms in speech. "In the situation when a professional stress is frequent, there appears a need to 'absorb emotions' and as a consequence a spontaneous speech even of highly qualified professionals with a good command of professional terminology is "encrusted" with professional jargonisms" [2].

Low-register disphemisation is typically disguised by mockery: **Dead head**, *a log in the water, either completely submerged or primarily submerged. A sinker log. Before railroads and trucking, most goods came by water. Trees felled, would be cut into log lengths, lashed into log rafts, and floated down river. Some logs would sink. Some logs would only reveal a small portion of itself, resembling a head. The log's ultimate destination could be a mill for sawing into dimension lumber or a port where they might be shipped elsewhere.* **widow maker**, *something that looks innocuous that is, in fact, dangerous. A loose limb or top hanging in a tree that can be dislodged by wind or when struck by a falling tree; the impact of which can cause serious injury or death; cat face*, scar or deformed section at the base of a tree caused by rot or fire.

(Semi-)closedness and encapsulation of professional communities, long periods of free time, emotional arousal, high risks, violence are pragmatic causes of a number of ironic and sarcastic words coinage in professional communities. Mockery verbalized in jokes, fables, myths, practical jokes is a special value. Humour, irony and sarcasm serve as denunciators of laziness, self-conceit, violence, underdevelopment, ignorance.

Thus, the main instrument the professional substandard uses to define the domain of "the possible" is by establishing the lowest limit of nominating the referent (euphemism/dysphemism) and mockery. Ameliorative connotation though possible: **squirrel**, *a weight used to swing a boom when the power unit does not have enough drums to do it mechanically.* **Squirrel tree**, *a topped tree, guyed if necessary, near the spar tree in which the counter balance (squirrel) of a tree rigged boom is hung etc.)* is not typical for professional substandard.

IV. The definition of extension implies the division of all notions into three extension categories (mine/ours, alien, and unknown) and matching each notion with the corresponding class. The common attitude of a community is towards encapsulation, a kind of confinement, achieved with the help of the language and behaviour. The range of the ways the attitude is emphasised is vast: pronunciation, gestures, postures, speech (collocations, bastardized language) and the way of life. In other words there is a vast system of means, both linguistic and extra-linguistic, to demonstrate one's belonging to a community [7]. The belonging to a community is emphasized both consciously and subconsciously.

Professional encapsulation is expressed in a tendency to oppose and counteract representatives of other professions. "The lower we descend into professional argot the stronger is the antithesis of 'we – they'. It is a universal phenomenon verbalized in vernacular in numerous invectives, nominations of 'aliens' are abusive and pejorative" [7].

Foresters are traditionally ironic towards tourists in the woods: **A virgin forest is where the hand of man has never set foot. A tree never hits an automobile except in self-defense.**

3. CONCLUSIONS

The research clearly indicates to the predominantly indirect ways of nominating pragmatic and linguistic norms in low-register forestry professional discourse and language. The most frequent ways of defining the borders of "the approved" and "the disapproved" are found in dysphemisms, ironic collocations, and words. The direct ways of verbalizing the norm include rules, regulations, proverbs, and sayings.

The taxonomy of the ways pragmatic norm of professional sublanguage includes: direct definitions, definitions by enumeration of senses, defining domain of "the possible", and definitions of extension. The Corpus analysis shows that the significance of the norm increases in cross-community communication and in cases when a (semi)-closed community tends to eliminate cross-community communication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

1. Fel'de, O.V. 2011. "Problemy i perspektivy leksikograficheskogo opisaniya russkogo professional'nogo substandarta" (Problems and prospects of the lexicographic description of the Russian professional substandard). in *Vestnik Cheljabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta – Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University*, no. 33, pp. 209-212.
2. Fel'de, O.V. 2011. "Komicheskoe v professional'nom diskurse. Kategorija komicheskogo v aspekte teorii i praktiki rechevogo vozdejstviya" (Humour in professional discourse. The category of humour in the theory and practice of speech influence). *Rechevoe obshchenie: specializirovannyj vestnik - Speech communication: specialized messenger*, no 13 (21), pp. 210 – 211.
3. Hudson, R., 2009. "Norm, Standard, Deviation." www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/dick/texts/giessen.doc (accessed March 10, 2014).
4. Korovushkin, V.P. 2009. *Osnovy kontrastivnoy sociolektologii*. (Fundamentals Of Contrastive Social Dialects Studies. Cherepovets: GOU VPO CSU, Part I. p. 245.
5. Nielsen, S. 2013. "A General Framework for Reviewing Dictionaries" in: *Multi-disciplinary Lexicography: Traditions and Challenges of the XXIst Century*, Ed. by O. Karpova, F. Kartashkova. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 145 – 157.
6. Solnyshkina, M. I. 2005. *Professional'nyj morskoy jazyk* (Professional language of the Navy). Moscow: Academia.
7. Elistratov, V. 2000. *Argo i kul'tura // Slovar' russkogo argo: Materialy 1980–1990-h gg.* (Argot and culture. Dictionary of the Russian argot: Materials, 1980-1990.). Moscow. pp. 574 – 692.
8. Solnyshkina, M. I. 2005. *Slovar' morskogo jazyka* (Dictionary of Naval Language). Moscow, Academia. 315 p.
9. Valieva, R. H. 2006. English-Russian dictionary of musical language. Universal and national-specific in the professional sublanguage: on the material of lexicon of Russian and English professional uncoded sublanguage of Music, PhD thesis, TSHU, Kazan, 2006, pp 133-168.
10. Ismaeva, F. H. 2006. Dictionary of professional language of sports. Kazan, KSU, 2006, pp108.
11. Kazachkova, M. B. 2008. *Slovar' professional'nogo jazyka aviatsii* (Dictionary of professional sublanguage of aviation). Odincovo, OSU. 152 p.
12. Korovushkin, V. P. 2000. *Slovar' russkogo voennogo zhargona: nestandartnaya leksika i frazeologiya vooruzhennykh sil i voenizirovannykh organizatsij Rossijskoj imperii, SSSR i Rossijskoj Federatsii XVIII – XX vekov* (Dictionary of Russian military slang: non-standard lexicon and phraseology of armed forces and militarized organizations of the Russian Empire, the USSR and the Russian Federation of the XVIII-XX centuries). Ekaterinburg Ural University., 372 p.
13. Mochelevskaja, E. V. 2009. *Russkij i anglo-russkij slovari professional'nogo podjazyka pozharnoj ohrany. Jetnokulturnaja markirovannost' edinic professional'nogo podjazyka (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo variantov podjazyka pozharnoj ohrany)*. Diss. kand. filol. nauk (Ethnocultural markedness of professional sublanguage units (on the material of the Russian and English sublanguage of fire protection service). PhD diss. Kazan. Tatar State University of Humanities and Education. Kazan, pp. 183-220.
14. Shchepanskaja, T. B. 2003. "Antropologija professij (Anthropology of professions)". *Zhurnal sociologii i social'noj antropologii – Magazine of sociology and social anthropology*, №.1 (21), pp. 139–161.
15. Cogan, M.L. 1953. "Toward a Definition of Profession/." in/ *Harvard Educational Review*. XXIII. Winter, pp.33 – 50.
16. Millerson, G. 1964. *The Qualifying Association*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 134 – 157.
17. *Slovar' russkogo jazyka: v 4 t. pod red. Evgen'eva A. P.* (Russian dictionary). Moscow, Polygraph resources., 1999. pp. 508-509.
18. Jones, Terry Palin, Michael /Tomlinson, Fred. "Lumberjack Song" <http://www.metrolyrics.com/lumberjack-song-lyrics-monty-python.html> (accessed February 10, 2014).
19. Krysin, L.P. 1977. *Jazyk v sovremennom obshchestve*. (Language In Today's Society). Moscow: Prosveshcheniye. p. 192.
20. Songs and Ballads of the Maine Lumberjacks London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Harvard University Press, 1925. 175 p. https://archive.org/stream/songsandballads011106mbp/songsandballads011106mbp_djvu.txt (accessed February 10, 2014).
21. Brehon Laws, 1999. <http://www.forestryfocus.ie/social-environmental-aspects/cultural-heritage/trees-and-folklore/brehon-laws/> (accessed February 10, 2014).
22. Galieva, A.M., Zamaletdinov, R.R., 2014. Tatar Possessive Verbs with the Meaning Component "Part of Plant". *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 21 (1), pp. 229-233. <http://www.idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr21%281%2914/39.pdf> (accessed December 5, 2014).
23. The Dictionary of Forestry, 2008. <http://dictionaryofforestry.org/dict/browse/> (accessed March 10, 2014).
24. Forestry, 2004. http://www.alphadictionary.com/directory/Specialty_Dictionaries/Forestry/ (accessed May 10, 2014).
25. Timberati, 2014. <https://timberati.wordpress.com/tag/forestry-slang/> (accessed April 21, 2014).
26. Forestry terminology – sources, 2015. <http://www.fao.org/forestry/terminology/25213/en/> (accessed March 10, 2014).

27. Terms used in forestry and logging, 1905. <https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/6265/terms%20used%20in%20forestry%20%5Bocr%5D.pdf?sequence=1> (accessed March 10, 2014).
28. Appendix: Glossary of lumberjack jargon, 2014. http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Appendix:Glossary_of_lumberjack_jargon (accessed February 10, 2015).
29. The Indian River, 2008. <http://www.starinfo.com/ljguide/events/rules.shtml> (accessed February 10, 2015).
30. Logging Lingo, 2015. <http://www.history.com/shows/ax-men/articles/logging-lingo> (accessed February 10, 2015).
31. Kennedy J. J., Sutto W. R. J. 1978. New Zealand Forest Managers - A Subculture? http://www.nzjf.org/free_issues/nzjf23_2_1978/3fa2a557-10a0-44d2-867b-c8be4c9c3a17.pdf (accessed February 10, 2015).
32. Shuhov, A. *Problema singular'nogo nachala modelirujushhej rekonstrukcii i social'nogo razvitija* (Problem of the singular beginning of modeling reconstruction and social development) <http://nounivers.narod.ru/hist/funct.htm> (accessed 11 July 2012).
33. Bannikov, K. L. 2000. "V armii, kak na zone: nasilie i unizhenie stali normoy" (In the army, is just like in prison: the violence and humiliation became norm). In *Novaja kamchatskaja pravda – New Kamchatka truth*, 2000, no. 12. http://www.iks.ru/~nkp/arhiv/html_arhiv/2000/12/12_2.html (accessed 30 March 2000).